

1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18777

as our own, and I am happy to report that the resolution which is before the Assembly has the support of both Governments.

Speaking on behalf of the United States, let me say what has been said many times before: The United States has no intention of placing in orbit around the earth any weapons of mass destruction, of installing such weapons on celestial bodies, or of stationing such weapons in outer space in any other manner. The United States intends to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in the conduct of the foregoing activities by others.

The United States fully intends to pursue this policy.

We recognize that it is not possible to foresee today all events which may at a future time occur in the newly emerging field of space technology and in the exploration and use of outer space. Nor can we foresee fully the outcomes of continuing efforts to achieve disarmament. Naturally if events as yet unforeseen suggest the need for a further look at this matter we would acquaint the U.N. with such events.

I have set forth my Government's policy of refraining from orbiting weapons of mass destruction in outer space and have reiterated our firm endorsement of this resolution. I am certain that the members of this committee are fully aware of the value of this resolution and I would, on behalf of my Government, strongly recommend it to them.

My Government is gratified at this important step we are about to take. We believe it should help reduce international tension. The United States hopes that there will be unanimous agreement to this resolution. We believe that by faithfully following the policy expressed in it we will help make the world a safer place in which to live. By avoiding a nuclear arms race in space we will have taken one further step on the road to disarmament.

INCORPORATION OF THE CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 1914) to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 1914 and that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1914) to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

SPACE AND NATIONAL PRIORITIES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the question which Congress must answer in determining this year's appropriation for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is not whether we should or should not explore outer space, or even whether we should or should not try to land American astronauts on the moon. Space exploration is a great challenge to the human mind and spirit which may bring great benefits to humanity. The United States is uniquely endowed with

the human and material resources to meet this challenge. It is within our means and in our interests to sustain a continuing effort in the exploration of outer space.

The real question before Congress is one of priorities, of how we are to allocate our great but not unlimited resources among many important national programs, of which space is only one. We must consider the NASA appropriation in the context of overall national needs, distinguishing between urgent and marginal goals, between programs which are essential and those which are merely desirable.

For reasons which I shall attempt to set forth, I believe that we are placing excessive emphasis on space in relation to other national programs, notably in the areas of education and employment. The benefits of space exploration may indeed be considerable, but they are remote and incalculable. The need for schools and jobs is immediate and pressing. The space program, we are told, is important for our security and especially our prestige. This is perhaps true, but the education of our people and the growth of our economy are far more important because these are the foundations of national power. To allow them to deteriorate is to undermine our national security as surely as would the dismantling of our military power.

There is, I believe, a dangerous imbalance between our efforts in armaments and space on the one hand and employment and education on the other. The proposed appropriation for NASA, in my opinion, reflects this imbalance. I believe that it should be substantially reduced. I further believe that any funds which are withheld from the space program should be reallocated to programs of education and employment which are before Congress this year.

The question before us, as I have said, is not whether we should or should not send a manned rocket ship to the moon but whether the project is so vital and so urgent as to warrant the indefinite postponement of other national efforts. This question has been debated at length in recent months, both in the Congress and in various publications. I have heard nothing to persuade me that it would be a national calamity if the landing on the moon were delayed until 1980 or 1990. I have heard and seen a great deal which persuades me that our continuing neglect of deteriorating schools and rising unemployment would be a national calamity.

The argument most frequently heard in support of Project Apollo is that if we do not pursue a crash program in space the Russians will get to the moon ahead of us. This argument can be challenged on two grounds: first, it is not at all clear that the Russians are trying to beat us to the moon; second—and more important—it is even less clear that it would be an irretrievable disaster if they did.

Sir Bernard Lovell, director of the Jodrell Bank Observatory in Britain, reported after a visit in July to Soviet space observatories that he saw no evidence of a high priority manned moon program. Sir Bernard was told by Russian scien-

tists that they saw insuperable economic and technical problems to landing a man on the moon and that in any case they believed they could get nearly all the information they wanted by a soft landing of instruments on the moon. "I think, at the moment," said Sir Bernard, "the Americans are racing themselves concerning moon research."

What if Sir Bernard is wrong and the Russians really are committed to a race to the moon? What if they do get there first? Would that be an unmitigated disaster and disgrace for America? Would it make us a second-rate people, shamed in the eyes of the world, and in our own eyes, as well? I do not think so. I think it would be a temporary embarrassment and annoyance, but not a calamity. It would hurt our pride, but not our lives as free men in a free society. Most emphatically, it would not change the course of history.

The issue, as I have said, is one of priorities. It would be a fine thing indeed to have an American landing party on the moon before 1970. The question which we must ask ourselves is whether it is really worth 20 or 30 billion dollars for the glory and prestige of being first. Sir Bernard Lovell, himself an advocate of a manned moon flight, admitted recently that "people everywhere now are getting so inured to the amazing success in space that by 1967 or 1970 the landing of a man on the moon might not cause more stir than the launching of another cosmonaut or astronaut does now." But even if the world were to react with enormous enthusiasm to a landing on the moon, is it really worth 20 billion dollars or more solely for the pleasure and satisfaction of dazzling the world with our prowess and our skill? Again, I do not think so.

The conflict between freedom and dictatorship is a great deal more than a competition in technological stunts. The real issue is between two conflicting concepts of man and of his life in organized societies. It is on this level that the contest between freedom and communism will ultimately be resolved. Does it not follow that our success in this struggle has a great deal to do with our capacity to employ and educate our people, to create the conditions for human happiness and individual fulfillment in a free society?

If, at the end of this decade, the Russians should have reached the moon, and we should not, but if we, instead, have succeeded in building the best system of public education in the world, in the renovation of our cities and transport, in the virtual elimination of slums and crime, in the alleviation of poverty and disease, whose prestige would be higher, who would then be ahead in the worldwide struggle for the minds and the allegiance of men?

The mind does not readily grasp the significance of a sum of \$20 or \$30 billion. Warren Weaver, vice president of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, has provided some dramatic comparisons between the cost of the moon race and that of some urgently needed projects here on earth. With \$30 billion, he points out, we could give a 10-percent raise in salary,